

No. 445, dated the 6th May, 1977.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

Dated the 6th May, 1977.

NATHU RAM SHARMA,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

The 6th June, 1977

No. 4257-4Lab-77/13649.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the President of India, is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak, in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s. Pawan Steel, Khawra Road, Bahalgarh.

BEFORE SHRI MOHAN LAL JAIN, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, HARYANA,
ROHTAK

Reference No. 4 of 1977

between

SHRI GURPAL SINGH AND OTHERS WORKMEN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S
PAWAN STEEL, KHAWRA ROAD, BAHALGARH

AWARD

By order No. ID/7535, dated 2nd March, 1977, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the management of M/s. Pawan Steel, Khawra Road, Bahalgarh and its workmen Shri Gurpal Singh and others to this Court, for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

Whether the termination of services of the following workmen was justified and in order? If not, to what relief are they entitled?

1. Shri Gurpal Singh
2. Shri Bhawani Parshad.
3. Shri Raghbir Singh.
4. Shri Yar Ali.
5. Shri Ram Ajohar.
6. Shri Inder Singh.
7. Shri Ram Dulare.
8. Shri Daya Ram.
9. Shri Lakhi Ram.

Whereas Shri M. S. Rathi authorised representative for the workmen put in his appearance on 18th April, 1977 in response to the usual notices of reference sent to him, on behalf of the workmen the management failed to appear on that date despite service of such notice.

Shri M. S. Rathi who actually raised the demand on the management on behalf of the workmen, however, made a statement on 18th April, 1977 before me, that the demand of the workman concerned had been satisfied in full, by way of a mutual amicable settlement arrived at between the parties. It would thus appear that the demand raised on the management by the workman has been fully satisfied and there is now no dispute between the parties requiring adjudication.

I accordingly answer the reference while returning the award in these terms.

Dated : 25th April, 1977.

MOHAN LAL JAIN,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Rohtak.

No. 850, dated the 29th April, 1977.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

MOHAN LAL JAIN,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Rohtak.

The 8th June, 1977

No. 4933-3Lab-77/13831.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the President of India is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak, in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s Hindustan Pottery Industries, Bahadurgarh.

BEFORE SHRI MOHAN LAL JAIN, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, HARYANA,
ROHTAK

Reference No. 90 of 1976

between

SHRI RAM BRICK, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S HINDUSTAN POTTERY
INDUSTRIES, BAHADURGARH

AWARD

By order No. ID/RK/244-M/76/43501, dated 23rd November, 1976, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the management of M/s. Hindustan Pottery Industries, Bahadurgarh, and its workman Shri Ram Brick to this Court, for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (1) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947:—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Ram Brick was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

The parties put in their appearance in this Court in response to the usual notices of reference sent to them.

Shri M. S. Rathl authorised representative for the workman made his statement before me on 3rd May, 1977 that the workman concerned did not propose to proceed with the demand raised by him on the management leading to this reference and that the same be treated as withdrawn.

It would thus appear that there is now no dispute between the parties requiring adjudication and the demand of the workman has been fully satisfied. I hold accordingly and answer the reference while returning the award in these terms.

Dated the 7th May, 1977.

MOHAN LAL JAIN,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Rohtak.

No. 907, dated 16th May, 1977

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

MOHAN LAL JAIN,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Rohtak.